

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:
AVERY N. GOLDSTEIN
GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON
& CITKOWSKI, P.C.
280 N. OLD WOODWARD AVENUE, SUITE 400
BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---|
| Applicant's or agent's file reference ZAA-10290/03 | | Date of Mailing (day/month/year) 29 DEC 2003 |
| International application No. PCT/US02/09667 | | REPLY DUE within 2 months/days from the above date of mailing |
| International filing date (day/month/year) 28 March 2002 (28.03.2002) | Priority date (day/month/year) | |
| International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): G06K 9/00, 5/00, 3/00; G07B 15/02; G06F 15/00; B42D 15/00 and US Cl.: 340/5.83, 5.26; 235/380, 375, 376, 384; 382/115, 116, 124, 127; 283/75; 705/16, 35, 44 | | |
| Applicant AL-SHEIKH, ZAHER | | |

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
 - I ☒ Basis of the opinion
 - II ☐ Priority
 - III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
 - V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - VI ☐ Certain documents cited
 - VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
 - VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby **invited to reply** to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).~~

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 28 July 2004 (28.07.2004).

| | |
|--|---|
| Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703)305-3230 | Authorized officer Michael Horabik Telephone No. (703) 305-4700 |
|--|---|

I. Basis of the opinion**1. With regard to the elements of the international application:***

- ☒ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
pages 1-7, as originally filed
pages NONE, filed with the demand
pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the claims:
pages 8-11, as originally filed
pages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
pages NONE, filed with the demand
pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the drawings:
pages 1-2, as originally filed
pages NONE, filed with the demand
pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
pages NONE, as originally filed
pages NONE, filed with the demand
pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☒ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☒ the description, pages none
- ☒ the claims, Nos. none
- ☒ the drawings, sheets/~~fig~~ none

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-----|
| Novelty (N) | Claims <u>1-24</u> | YES |
| | Claims <u>none</u> | NO |
| Inventive Step (IS) | Claims <u>none</u> | YES |
| | Claims <u>1-24</u> | NO |
| Industrial Applicability (IA) | Claims <u>1-24</u> | YES |
| | Claims <u>NONE</u> | NO |

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Claims 1 - 24 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over John L. Barclay (US 6158658; hereinafter Barclay) in view of John R. Wolfram (US 5051565; hereinafter Wolfram).

Regarding claims 1, 6, 10, 14 - 16, and 21, Barclay teaches a process for encoding an access pass with an image of an authorized user to facilitate identity verification (fig. 1), which comprises the steps of verifying the identity of the user beyond a security perimeter (46, figure 2; col. 4, lines 35 - 44); taking an electronic image of the user with a camera capable of generating a computer-storage image output (110, fig. 4; col. 2, lines 47 - 56). Claim 10 adds the limitation of a self-supporting access pass having a machine readable data series selected from the group consisting of bar code and magnetic strip encoding a reference number (col. 3, lines 4 - 10).

Barclay teaches the steps of scanning the passenger code printed on the attached baggage tag in order to recover and displays the image of the passenger who checked the baggage (col. 6, lines 7 - 18), but fails to specifically teach the steps of printing a human-cognizable image of the user directly onto said access pass.

However, Wolfram teaches, in the same field of endeavor, baggage and passenger matching method and system which comprises the steps of printing a human-cognizable image of the user directly onto said access pass (40 and 14B, fig. 2; col. 4, line 1 - 11).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have printed a human-cognizable image of the user directly onto said access pass in Barclay's device as taught by Wolfram for the purpose of verifying that the correct passenger is boarding.

Regarding claims 2 and 17, Barclay and Wolfram teach all the limitations in claim 1, and Barclay further teaches the step of associating said computer-storable image output with an individualized travel datum of the passenger (col. 3, lines 11 - 23).

Regarding claims 3 and 18, Barclay and Wolfram teach all the limitations in claim 1, and Barclay further teaches that said electronic image is stored in a computer system (112, fig. 4; col. 4, lines 35 - 44; claimed database).

Regarding claims 4 and 19, Barclay and Wolfram teach all the limitations in claim 1, and Barclay further teaches the step of collecting an electronic image of a luggage article in the possession of the user; and storing said luggage article electronic image in the centralized database (col. 1, lines 29 - 57).

Regarding claims 5 and 20, Barclay and Wolfram teach all the limitations in claim 1, and Barclay further teaches that said human-cognizable image appears on a video display as retrieved from said centralized database upon entry of an individualized travel datum of the passenger (col. 2, lines 52 - 54).

Regarding claims 7 - 9, 12 - 13, and 22 - 24, Barclay and Wolfram teach all the limitations in claim 1, but fails to specifically teach that the centralized database is accessible through an Internet connection (claim 7); wherein said human-cognizable image of the user is of a user face (claim 8); and wherein said human-cognizable image of the user is of a user fingerprint. However, the examiner takes official notice that all these limitations are well known in the art.

Regarding claim 11, Barclay and Wolfram teach all the limitations in claim 1, and Barclay further teaches that said bar code is two-dimensional (col. 3, line 44 - 47).

----- NEW CITATIONS -----

US 6,158,658 A (BARCLAY) 12 December 2000, see entire document.

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.